

REMARKS

Claims 2-39 are pending. Claim 1 has been canceled. The typographical error on specification page 32 has been corrected. Entry of the amendment is respectfully requested. No new matter has been added. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Indication of Allowable Subject Matter

On Action page 5, claims 2-23 and 25-34 were indicated allowable if rewritten in an independent format. Claims 2 and 3 have been rewritten in an independent format as requested by the Office. Claim 3 recites an *arcuate* projecting surface that is adjacent to, *transversely* disposed from, and extending radially outward *beyond* the high friction arcuate segment. Claim 24 has been made to depend from claim 3. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 2-34 are now allowable.

The Claim Rejections

The Action admits that Furuki does not teach or suggest the picker member (picker roller 3) having a high friction arcuate segment nor the structural ability to prevent the deformation of the leading edge of a note being picked from a stack. Geib cannot alleviate the deficiencies of Furuki as it does not teach or suggest the recited features which are not found in Furuki. For example, Geib indicates roller (14) as the picker roller (col. 9, line 38), whereas the alleged high friction arcuate segment (surface 13) in Geib is on the drum roller (12) (col. 9, lines 42-44). Regardless, neither Furuki nor Geib, taken alone or in combination, teach or suggest the recited features and relationships in the claims.

Claim 35

Claim 35 recites language similar to allowable subject matter in claims 2 and 22. For example, claim 35 recites an *arcuate* projecting portion that includes an arcuate projecting surface (claim 2). Furthermore, the arcuate projecting portion is a *low friction* arcuate projecting portion (claim 22). Additionally, the arcuate projecting portion is *axially* disposed from the high friction arcuate segment. The references, taken alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest the recited features and relationships in claim 35. The Office has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

Claim 36

Claim 36 recites that the *arcuate* projecting surface is adjacent to and *transversely* disposed from the high friction surface. Furthermore, the arcuate projecting surface extends *only a portion* of the distance that the high friction surface extends. Claim 36 also recites language similar to allowable subject matter in claim 2. The references, taken alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest the recited features and relationships in claim 36. The Office has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

Claims 38 and 39

Claims 38 and 39 recite language similar to that acknowledged as allowable in connection with claims 2, 3 and 22. However, these claims do not recite the features of the end note as the picking member acts on the end note. It is submitted that these claims are allowable.

Fee For Extra Independent Claim

Six (6) independent claims are pending. Please charge the fee associated with the submission of three additional independent claim (\$600), two additional total claims (\$100), and any other fee due to Deposit Account 09-0428.

Conclusion

Applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance.

The undersigned will be happy to discuss any aspect of the Application by telephone at the Office's convenience.

Respectfully submitted,



Ralph E. Jocke Reg. No. 31,029
WALKER & JOCKE
231 South Broadway
Medina, Ohio 44256
(330) 721-0000